arXiv:1405.0320v1 [cs.SC] 1 May 2014

COMPUTING ALL AFFINE SOLUTION SETS OF BINOMIAL SYSTEMS (EXTENDED ABSTRACT)

DANKO ADROVIC AND JAN VERSCHELDE

Abstract. To compute solutions of sparse polynomial systems efficiently we have to exploit the structure of their Newton polytopes. While the application of polyhedral methods naturally excludes solutions with zero components, an irreducible decomposition of a variety is typically understood in affine space, including also those components with zero coordinates. For the problem of computing solution sets in the intersection of some coordinate planes, the direct application of a polyhedral method fails, because the original facial structure of the Newton polytopes may alter completely when selected variables become zero. Our new proposed method enumerates all factors contributing to a generalized permanent and toric solutions as a special case of this enumeration. For benchmark problems such as the adjacent 2-by-2 minors of a general matrix, our methods scale much better than the witness set representations of numerical algebraic geometry.

1. Introduction

Our investigation in [3] starts with the sparsest kind of polynomial systems: those with exactly two monomials with nonzero coefficients in every equation. This sparsest type of systems is called *binomial*. Software implementations of primary decompositions of binomial ideals [9] are described in [6] and [19]. Recent algebraic algorithms are developed in [15] and [18]. The complexity of counting the total number of affine solutions of a system of n binomials in n variables was shown as #P-complete [7]. In [13] combinatorial conditions for the existence of positive dimensional solution sets are given, for use in a geometric resolution. Symbolic polyhedral algorithms for computing isolated roots of sparse systems are in [12].

2. Monomial Maps representing Affine Solution Sets

Solution sets of binomial systems can be described as monomial maps, obtained via unimodular coordinate transformations [1], see also [10] and [14]. Note that some sparse polynomial systems such as the cyclic n-roots problems have monomial maps as solution sets [2].

Definition 2.1. A *monomial map* of a d-dimensional solution set in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is

$$x_k = c_k t_1^{v_{1,k}} t_2^{v_{2,k}} \cdots t_d^{v_{d,k}}, \quad c_k \in \mathbb{C}, v_{i,k} \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ and $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

For a toric solution, all coefficients c_k in the monomial map (1) are nonzero. For an affine solution set, several coordinates may be zero. When setting variables to zero, it may happen that all constraints on some other variables vanish, then we say that those variables are *free*, while others are still linked to a toric solution of a subset of the original equations.

Date: 29 April 2014.

3. A Generalized Permanent

To enumerate all choices of variables to be set to zero, we use the matrix of exponents of the monomials to define a bipartite graph between monomials and variables.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ be a system. We collect all monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$ that occur in $\mathbf{f}$ along the rows of the matrix, yielding the *incidence matrix*

$$M_{\mathbf{f}}[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}, x_k] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad a_k > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad a_k = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Variables which occur anywhere with a negative exponent are dropped.

Example 3.2. For all adjacent minors of a 2-by-3 matrix, the incidence matrix is

$$M_{\mathbf{f}} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccccc} & x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\ \hline x_{11}x_{22} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ x_{21}x_{12} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ x_{12}x_{23} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ x_{22}x_{13} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array}\right] \tag{3}$$

for the system defined by $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2)$ with $f_1 = x_{11}x_{22} - x_{21}x_{12}$ and $f_2 = x_{12}x_{23} - x_{22}x_{13}$. For this example, the rows of $M_{\mathbf{f}}$ equal the exponents of the monomials. We select x_{12} and x_{22} as variables to be set to zero, as overlapping columns x_{12} with x_{22} gives all ones.

Proposition 3.3. *Let S be a subset of variables such that for all $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}$ occurring in $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$: $M[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}, x_k] = 1$, for $x_k \in S$, then setting all $x_k \in S$ to zero makes all polynomials of $\mathbf{f}$ vanish.*

Proof. $M[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}}, x_k] = 1$ means: $x_k = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} = 0$. If the selection of the variables in S is such that all monomials in the system have at least one variable appearing with positive power, then setting all variables in S to zero makes all monomials in the system vanish. □

Enumerating all subsets of variables so that $\mathbf{f}$ vanishes when all variables in a subset are set to zero is similar to a row expansion algorithm on $M_{\mathbf{f}}$ for a permanent:

Algorithm 3.4 (recursive subset enumeration via row expansion of permanent)**.**

```
Input: M_f is the incidence matrix of f(x) = 0;
       index of the current row in M_f; and
       S is the current selection of variables.
Output: all S that make the entire f vanish.
if M[x^a, x_k] = 1 for some x_k ∈ S
  then print S if x^a is at the last row of M_f or else go to the next row
  else for all k: M[x^a, x_k] = 1 do
         S := S ∪ {x_k}
         if x^a is at the last row of M_f
           then print S
           else go to the next row
         S := S \ {x_k}
```

Greedy enumeration strategies can be applied in the algorithm above. The enumeration may generate subsets of variables that lead to affine monomial maps that are contained in other solution maps. For detailed membership tests we refer to [3].

4. Computational Experiments

The polynomial equations of adjacent minors are defined in [11, page 631]: $x_{i,j}x_{i+1,j+1} - x_{i+1,j}x_{i,j+1} = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. For $m = 2$, the solution set is pure dimensional of degree 2^n and of dimension $2n - (n-1) = n+1$, the number of irreducible components of X equals the nth Fibonacci number [20, Theorem 5.9].

For a pure dimensional set, we restrict the enumeration: for every variable we set to zero, one equation has to vanish as well. Table 1 shows the comparison with a witness set construction, computed with version 2.3.70 of PHCpack [21]. Note that our method returns the irreducible decomposition, which is more than just a witness set. This system is one of the benchmarks in [4], but neither Bertini [5] nor Singular [8] can get as far as our method.

n	2^{n-1}	#maps	search	witness
3	4	2	0.00	0.03
4	8	3	0.00	0.16
5	16	5	0.00	0.68
6	32	8	0.00	2.07
7	64	13	0.01	7.68
8	128	21	0.01	28.10
9	256	34	0.02	71.80
10	512	55	0.05	206.01
11	1024	89	0.10	525.46
12	2048	144	0.24	—
13	4096	233	0.57	—
14	8192	377	1.39	—
15	16384	610	3.33	—
16	32768	987	8.57	—
17	65536	1597	21.36	—
18	131072	2584	55.95	—
19	262144	4181	140.84	—
20	524288	6765	372.62	—
21	1048576	10946	994.11	—


times on the adjacent 2-by-2 minors of 2-by-n matrix
monomial maps
witness sets
seconds on 3.47GHz Intel X5690 and 23.4GB memory
0
200
400
600
800
1000
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
comparing witness set construction with combinatorial search

Table 1. The construction of a witness set for all adjacent minors of a general 2-by-n matrix requires the tracking of 2^{n-1} paths and is much more expensive than the combinatorial search. For n from 3 to 21 column 3 lists times in seconds on one core at 3.49GHz for the combinatorial search and times ($<$ 1,000 seconds) for the witness construction are in the last columns.

Table 2 shows timings of the `binomialCellularDecomposition` in the `Binomials` [16] package of Macaulay2 [17] applied to the ideal defined by the adjacent minors.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
time	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.11	0.24	0.49	0.98	1.97	4.11	8.96	22.3	54.7	160.8

Table 2. CPU time in seconds on one 3.49GHz core on the adjacent minors.

As for the adjacent minors of a general 2-by-n matrix the number of components returned by the cellular decomposition equals the number of components in an irreducible decomposition, the comparison seems fair.

References

[1] D. Adrovic and J. Verschelde. Computing Puiseux series for algebraic surfaces. In J. van der Hoeven and M. van Hoeij, editors, *Proceedings of ISSAC 2012*, pages 20–27. ACM, 2012.

[2] D. Adrovic and J. Verschelde. Polyhedral methods for space curves exploiting symmetry applied to the cyclic n-roots problem. In V.P. Gerdt, W. Koepf, E.W. Mayr, and E.V. Vorozhtsov, editors, *Proceedings of CASC 2013*, pages 10–29, 2013.

[3] D. Adrovic and J. Verschelde. A Polyhedral Method to Compute all Affine Solution Sets of Sparse Polynomial Systems. `arXiv:1310.4128v1 [cs.SC]`.

[4] D.J. Bates, W. Decker, J.D. Hauenstein, C. Peterson, G. Pfister, F.-O. Schreyer, A.J. Sommese, and C.W. Wampler. Comparison of probabilistic algorithms for analyzing the components of an affine algebraic variety. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 231: 619–633, 2014.

[5] D.J. Bates, J.D. Hauenstein, A.J. Sommese, and Wampler C.W. Bertini: Software for numerical algebraic geometry. Available at `www.nd.edu/∼sommese/bertini`, 2006.

[6] A.M. Bigatti, R. La Scala, and L. Robbiano. Computing toric ideals. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 27(4):351–365, 1999.

[7] E. Cattani and A. Dickenstein. Counting solutions to binomial complete intersections. *J. Complexity*, 23(1):82–107, 2007.

[8] W. Decker, G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister, and H. Schönemann. SINGULAR 3-1-3. a computer algebra system for polynomial computations. Available at `www.singular.uni-kl.de`, 2011.

[9] D. Eisenbud and B. Sturmfels. Binomial ideals. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 84(1):1–45, 1996.

[10] D. Grigoriev and A. Weber. Complexity of solving systems with few independent monomials and applications to mass-action kinetics. In V.P. Gerdt, W. Koepf, E.W. Mayr, and E.V. Vorozhtsov, editors, *Proceedings of CASC 2012*, pages 143–154. Springer, 2012.

[11] S. Hoşten and J. Shapiro. Primary decomposition of lattice basis ideals. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 29(4&5):625–639, 2000.

[12] M.I. Herrero, G. Jeronimo, and J. Sabia. Computing isolated roots of sparse polynomial systems in affine space. *Theoretical Computer Science* 411(44–46):3894–3904, 2010.

[13] M.I. Herrero, G. Jeronimo, and J. Sabia. Affine solution sets of sparse polynomial systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 51(1):34–54, 2012.

[14] E. Hubert and G. Labahn. Rational invariants of scalings from Hermite normal forms. In J. van der Hoeven and M. van Hoeij, editors, *Proceedings of ISSAC 2012*, pages 219–226. ACM, 2012.

[15] T. Kahle. Decomposition of binomial ideals. *Annals of the institute of statistical mathematics*, 62(4):727–745, 2010.

[16] T. Kahle. Decomposition of binomial ideals. *Journal of Software for Algebra and Geometry*, 4:1-5, 2012.

[17] D.R. Grayson and M.E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`.

[18] I. Ojeda. Binomial canonical decompositions of binomial ideals. *Communications in Algebra*, 39(10): 3722–3735, 2011.

[19] I. Ojeda and R. Peidra. Cellular binomial ideals. Primary decomposition of binomial ideals. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 30(4):383–400, 2000.

[20] B. Sturmfels. *Solving Systems of Polynomial Equations*. Number 97 in CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. AMS, 2002.

[21] J. Verschelde. Algorithm 795: PHCpack: A general-purpose solver for polynomial systems by homotopy continuation. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 25(2):251–276, 1999.

University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, 851 S. Morgan Street (m/c 249), Chicago, IL 60607-7045, USA

E-mail address: `{adrovic,jan}@math.uic.edu (Corresponding author: Jan Verschelde)`